



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2023

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3308741

781 Green Lane, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM8 1DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Limon Rifat Hossain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/01420/HSE, dated 11 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2022.
 - The proposed development is the construction of a first floor side and part rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a first floor side and part rear extension at 781 Green Lane, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM8 1DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01420/HSE, dated 11 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following submitted plans: drawing ref. 21268-PL01 – site location and block plan; drawing ref. 21268-PL04 – proposed plan; drawing ref. 21268-PL05 – proposed plan; and drawing ref. 21268-PL06 – proposed elevations.
 - (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's notice of decision, as it most accurately describes the proposal than that contained on the planning application form.
3. The Council has also referred in its decision to policies within The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan 2037 (Regulation 19 Submission Version, December 2021) (BDDLDP). I note that the draft plan is at Examination, and therefore at an advanced stage. However, at the current time it does not form part of the statutory development plan and I have not been made aware as to whether there are any unresolved objections in relation to the cited policies. I therefore attach limited weight to those policies in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of properties of which it is part, and the surrounding area including the Becontree Estate, with particular regard to its siting, scale and design.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end terraced dwelling that has been extended at single storey level to its side and rear elevations with flat roofed extensions, its main roof has also been changed from a hip to a gable, along with the addition of a rear dormer window across its rear roof plane. The property also features a front porch, and its original brick exterior has been changed to a painted render finish. The front elevations of other properties in the terrace are much less altered compared to the appeal site, and the property at the opposite end of the terrace has retained its original hipped roof and its side elevation has not been extended.
6. The appeal property faces onto and is visible from Green Lane, on one side of the appeal site are a pair of semi-detached dwellings (No. 779 Green Lane and No. 2 Lymington Road), which occupy a corner location and face onto the junction between Green Lane and Lymington Road. These properties are diagonally positioned and set well back from the junction, as a result there are also views of the side of the appeal property from both Green Lane and Lymington Road.
7. Although there is some more recent residential development opposite the site, the wider area including the appeal site and the terrace it forms part, is mainly characterised by terraced and semi-detached properties of a similar style mainly having hipped roofs in a distinctive form. This being part of the Becontree Estate, a housing development of 'Homes for Heroes', which the Council identify to be locally distinctive and historically important.
8. Views of the front and side of the appeal property from Green Lane and Lymington Road show its out of place new gable end, including its bulky dormer window and part tiled dormer side, its flat roofed side extension, and its retained and protruding eaves line of its original hipped roof. The cumulative effect of these changes, together with its conspicuous location, results in the appeal property having an unsympathetic appearance that detracts from the character and appearance of the terrace and the surrounding area.
9. The proposed extension would add a hipped roof design to the side of the property reflecting its original roof design, and because of its rearward projection, it would largely screen the protruding original eaves level on the new gable end, along with the side of the bulky dormer window including its tiled side. Whilst there are currently some different eaves heights on the property's front elevation, the proposed extension would match the eaves height of the host property, but with a much lower ridge height than the appeal property itself.
10. The proposed side extension would not extend up to the boundary with the adjoining property, No. 779 Green Lane, and would allow some separation and space to be retained between the respective properties. I also note that the proposed extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of the appeal

property and would wrap around part of its rear side. This would create a new opposing roof ridge line to that of the appeal property's main roof ridge. However, it would have a lower ridge height, partly due to its set back from the front elevation, which would ensure the extension has a subservient relationship to the host property on both its rear, front, and side elevations. The proposal would also be wholly above existing flat roofed single storey extensions. Consequently, I do not find the proposal to be unacceptable in its scale or constitute an overdevelopment of the site.

11. The proposed side extension is not sited to be parallel with the front of the terrace of properties, having a small set back. However, with the degree of change that has already taken place at the appeal property, this small set back is not harmful to the appearance of the host property or the terrace of dwellings in this case.
12. To conclude, the siting, scale, and design of the proposed extension would reflect and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of dwellings of which it forms part, or the character and appearance of the area, including the wider Becontree Estate. Accordingly the proposal complies with Policies CP2 and CP3 of The Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham, Core Strategy, adopted July 2010, Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of The Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham, Borough Wide Development Policies, Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011, and Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD6 of the draft BDDLPP insofar as they expect new development including residential extensions, to be high quality, add to the overall quality of an area and respect its distinctive local character including its cultural and historical value. The proposal would also comply with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks development that is sympathetic to the character and history of the area. Whilst there is a degree of conflict with The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted February 2012 (SPD), which says extensions should be parallel with the host property's front elevation, there would be no conflict with the SPD's purpose insofar as it requires extensions to relate sympathetically to the host property and the surrounding area.
13. The Council's decision notice refers to Policy D4 of The London Plan, adopted March 2021, which concerns the use of tools for design analysis, design review processes and maintaining design quality through to completion. Given the nature of the proposal, I did not find to be relevant to the determination of this appeal.

Conditions

14. I have imposed a standard implementation condition, along with a condition listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved. A materials condition is necessary to ensure the external materials of the proposed extension match those of the host property to protect the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, considering the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR